and accordingly, a transfer pursuant to Section 1146(c) of the bankruptcy code which shall not be taxed under any law imposing a stamp tax or similar tax."

Do you have any comment on that?

MS. NEVINS: I don't, Your Honor. I've seen that language.

Your Honor's probably inquiring about whether the government would agree with that or determine that that's not an enforceable provision.

THE COURT: They say that I entered this order, and they appear to be quoting from that order, which others drafted and I signed. But as we know from the Scott case, which you were involved in --

MS. NEVINS: Yes, Your Honor.

as to which they did not -- a consent order to which they did not participate. And I just wanted to see whether or not the IRS took a different view than this suggests and you're saying that you weren't there and -- add some focus on that paragraph.

MS. NEVINS: Your Honor, I'm not sure what the intent of that paragraph is; if it's to avoid the possibility as in *Scott*, the *Scott Cable* case, the intention was to avoid the imposition of capital gains tax generated by a sale under a plan of reorganization.

That was found by Your Honor and by other courts to be impermissible and a tax avoidance scheme or --

THE COURT: No, but the fee -- the tax avoidance scheme was the thrust of Scott.

MS. NEVINS: Correct. In this instance, I don't know if the intention of the parties is to have a determination that the assets being sold are not going to be subject to successor liability claims by the service or another taxing agency --

THE COURT: The reason --

MS. NEVINS: Or if it's a capital gains or income tax issue. I'm sorry.

THE COURT: The reason I raise it is because I don't want you all to leave court today and believe that that issue is off the table in the future.

MR. ROBERT GROSSMAN: Your Honor, if I may. The 1146 treatment in a case like this is generally (indiscernible) because it's a real -- there are underlying real estate assets. The issue is there are underlying real estate assets and the transfer of those assets would be free of transfer tax, but not the other issues Your Honor is raising.

THE COURT: I just want to -- I don't have -- I have a concern that people say this has already been raised and concluded by the order that is referred to in the March

6th, 2006 -- and that's the order of June 21.

MR. ROBERT GROSSMAN: Right, Your Honor. That's what I was standing up -- just so that the record reflects. what order that comes from. That comes from the June 21st, 2005 sale hearing, which I believe Ms. Nevins was in attendance for. I'm not trying to box her in on anything, but I just want to make sure that the record reflects the February 2nd hearing is a different hearing than that order --

THE COURT: Yes, but that order is now being modified and then modified again perhaps and I just don't want to have people say like at least tangentially it was going on this morning. This is off the table. The Court can't consider it. It's already in bed and the record is set.

MR. ROBERT GROSSMAN: Your Honor, the beneficiary of the order is SWJ and they're in court today to hear Your Honor.

MS. NEVINS: Your Honor, may I just inquire of the Court of the import of the debtor's counsel's earlier statement?

I believe the statement was that the taxes that are referred to are intended to be conveyance taxes imposed by a taxing authority based on a transfer of real property. I just want to confirm my understanding that that's what was --

THE COURT: Well, we could ask -- you could ask

that question through me and we can get an answer.

MR. ROBERT GROSSMAN: Your Honor, yes. Those are stamped -- we would only be able to stamp taxes which would be state and local. It wouldn't really affect the federal at all.

THE COURT: It says "Stamp or similar tax."

MR. ROBERT GROSSMAN: Yes, Your Honor. The case law is pretty clear.

THE COURT: All right. Anybody have anything else?

I'm going to take the position then that it's premature for me to consider a motion to dismiss or convert, or to set a hearing on any new motion to dismiss or convert.

That conclusion may change if I do not approve the sale that is proposed this morning and I will now address the question of whether or not to approve the sale that is proposed this morning.

We'll take a 10-minute recess.

(Recess from 11:40 a.m. until 11:47 a.m.)

THE COURT: All right. I'm going to start with the consideration of the sale and I'll give you all day, but you should know that if you're planning something for this afternoon, I'm going to have to leave the bench at 20 of 1:00 and I'll be back at 2:00. So hopefully, we can finish what we need to do in an hour and if we can't, we'll continue in the

afternoon.

All right. Who is proposing this sale?

MR. ROBERT GROSSMAN: Your Honor, the debtor and the committee and other creditors have joined together to propose the sale. The sale, we believe, has been explained to I think everybody in the courtroom and Your Honor prior is simply a new purchase price of \$11.25 million. The price to be paid, \$5.4 million in cash, as soon as Your Honor approves the sale, which is in the Arent Fox trust account as we speak.

The remaining amount of the sale, which math is sometimes not my suit, 5.85, is paid by the tendering of a note with nine percent interest payable by December, 2006.

That note --

THE COURT: December 31st or December 1st?

MR. ROBERT GROSSMAN: I think it's December 15th.

December 15th, Your Honor.

THE COURT: December 15.

MR. ROBERT GROSSMAN: 2006.

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. ROBERT GROSSMAN: It accrues at nine percent interest. The security for the note is a basket of assets that consists of all of the assets that the estate currently has that are being transferred to SWJ.

So upon the entry of the sale order, there would be

a closing, the assets would be transferred pursuant to the original asset purchase agreement which provides -- and I will make this clear -- that it is subject to various claims of the Mocco parties. It is also subject to asserted liens by Titan. And to the extent there are other liens, they're taking it subject to those liens. So the asset is being transferred subject to those liens.

THE COURT: Is there any equity if all of those liens are successfully prosecuted? Is there any equity?

MR. ROBERT GROSSMAN: If the parties against whom those liens -- an example, if Mr. Mocco is successful and Titan's liens -- I don't really understand so I can't talk about the magnitude of them -- but if those parties were successful, it is highly doubtful that the assets of the estate have any value.

THE COURT: No equity.

MR. ROBERT GROSSMAN: No. There would be no equity. SWJ -- yes, there's no equity. Their business decision is theirs.

In addition to that collateral, the estate is getting additional collateral for the note in the form of an assignment of proceeds from -- I term them bank guarantees. People have used different terms, but there are, as explained to the Court, approximately 12 -- there are 12 notes issued by the Bank of Bangkok for a total value of \$600 million.

And Cobra Ventura, which is an owner of SWJ, as was disclosed in a deposition and which we've known, has agreed that those assets for which they are the beneficiary will stand for the estate so that even if the estate -- if the assets that the estate transferred were for some reason to be valueless because Mr. Mocco and/or Titan succeeded in their face, we still would have access to the notes.

We make no representations -- I think Mr. Bainton and the rest of us have been careful to say we are describing the notes, there are a variety of views as to the enforceability of them. It's better to have it than not, but that -- I think that suffices.

In addition, Cobra Ventura itself, who's -- as I believe sole assets of the notes, but I'm not certain -- has agreed to become a guarantor on this note, the note the estate's getting.

One of the great -- one of the benefits of that is that it gives us a clear path to the notes if we need to proceed against them.

It also takes off the table, to some degree, an argument that Mr. Schreiber has advanced in the court that if the sale were not approved, then our ability to go after the note is somehow limited because the notes were only collateral. It's a peripheral issue. But that becomes the basket of collateral.

I think what Mr. Bainton and the rest of the parties really see is that we immediately have \$5.4 million of cash. We have attempted to use that in a manner to satisfy a lot of the issues that we see may come up in a plan, because that's really where we're moving, both with the internal revenue service, the unsecured's and the admins all working together.

If there certainly are additional funds -- if there are additional funds to the estate, that will certainly be to the betterment, but I think the reason the proponents are taking this position, the estate takes the position, the position espoused in court the last time, that I think even the Court recognized, essentially, the estate is left with the exact same claims that it has today if it has to go against its assets. It has the additional benefit of being able to go after the notes.

There is a subordination provision in the notes of approximately \$6 million, but I think most of us believe that having \$5 million today, rather than trying to have nothing commence actions to get basically back to where we are today, it's in the interest of the estate to have the \$5 million.

I think that it is in the interest of the estate because in part, that will provide funding for a liquidating trustee. The estate -- the committee, Mr. Bainton, Ms. Black and others believe that there are one or several other

targets that the estate will be proceeding against to seek additional revenues to bring into the estate. This would provide the necessary funds to do that.

So basically, the position is that we are giving up -- we are getting an additional series of collateral, we are maintaining a lien on all our existing assets.

I'm not advocating this -- I just bring up that the original contract price -- and the Court pointed out that it was sold for 8.9, but the original contract price, had there been no other bidders, was 5.5 million.

So when people determine what you would take for the estate, one could -- and the Court -- it was made very clear in the court that nobody believed anybody else would bid, was approximately the cash we have now.

I don't use that and say that there wasn't an 8.95 opening sale price. Arguments about the other bidder, all of that stuff is past -- there are responses to it, but it's not necessary.

But that's why we would urge the court -- I can also inform the Court that I've been informed directly by the parties who have put up -- excuse me. Have put up the money for SWJ and I know we've all been in courts many, many years and heard the ship is leaving.

I truly believe in this case, because of the basket of assets we're selling and the difficulty of getting your

arms around them, unless we do conclude the sale today, then as Your Honor well put, the proponents of the motion to convert will have won by default.

THE COURT: To confirm the sale today, what do you require from the court?

MR. ROBERT GROSSMAN: Your Honor, I think we merely require an entry of the form of order that had been submitted, which modifies the June 21st order that provides that the sale price in the form of cash and note is deemed in the best interest of the estate and satisfies that sale order and that's basically all we are asking for today.

THE COURT: So you have electronically transmitted to the clerk the modification of the June 21, '05 order.

MR. SCHREIBER: Your Honor, I believe it is attachment no. 1 to docket entry no. 904. There is only one other issue, Your Honor. I think --

THE COURT: Hold on one second. (Pause.)

THE COURT: Gentlemen, I'm going to have to have that order emailed to us in order for me to put my signature on it, if I decide to do that.

MR. SCHREIBER: We can do that, Your Honor. And I would add as of last night it was one verbiage change -- one language change that we've wanted to add, which is when it indicates that the \$5 million in cash we paid to the debtor -

```
1
        - it really was debtor's counsel that was supposed to be in
 2
        there and we apologize for that. But that one little change.
 3
                  THE COURT: Now, does everybody in this room have
        the text of the order you want me to see?
 4
 5
                  MR. SCHREIBER: Yes.
                  THE COURT: I have -- who's wagging yes, then
 6
        wagging no.
 7
                  MR. ROBERT GROSSMAN: Your Honor, if anybody
 8
 9
        doesn't, we will give it to them right away. It was served on
        everybody at one point. Whether they are technically sitting
10
11
        with it now I can't address.
12
                  THE COURT: Well, I need to have them have the text
13
        of --
14
                  MR. ROBERT GROSSMAN: I agree, Your Honor.
15
                  THE COURT: -- what you want me to sign before I
16
        sign it.
17
                  MR. ROBERT GROSSMAN: We can do that right now.
                  THE COURT: And perhaps I ought to adjourn or
18
19
        recess so you could do that.
                  MR. ROBERT GROSSMAN: I think they should be able to
20
21
        look at it, read it, so when Your Honor hopefully agrees to
        sign it --
22
23
                  THE COURT: Somebody may need to raise a question
24
        about it --
25
                  MR. SCHREIBER: Your Honor, it's the same order
```

that was given to them weeks ago. The same order without changes.

THE COURT: All right. Let me see -- the nay sayer's. Mr. Scarpone.

MR. SCARPONE: I want to see the order. There's been a lot of paper that was emailed around over the last couple of weeks. I want to see the order before it's entered and I don't have it with me right now.

THE COURT: All right. Ms. Nevins --

MS. NEVINS: Your Honor, I would also like the opportunity to just review one more time --

THE COURT: What I'm going to do at the end of this, if I decide to electronically sign it, is I'm going to ask all of you whether or not you have the authority to consent and understand that your consent will bind your clients and that this is not a work in progress.

It's the final product and that you expect me to sign it, and you're representing to me that if I sign it, you have read it and raise whatever objections you have to it, if any, and those -- and you'll all be bound by whatever I do, except your rights to appeal, but not appeal on the basis that you haven't seen it.

MR. ROBERT GROSSMAN: Your Honor, I would --

MR. SCARPONE: May I make one other request, and that is that -- I know -- we're into that same pattern again

today. Mr. Grossman is telling us that it has to close today. We have no evidence of that fact and by the way, we were told that last June, too.

THE COURT: All right. But I'm going to -
MR. SCARPONE: And we've -- but I want to object -
THE COURT: We've had enough time --

MR. SCARPONE: -- to representations of counsel being substituted for evidence. If there is a need to close today --

THE COURT: Sir, let me say this to you. I've asked everybody here if they have anything to say about what is being done. Everybody -- I gave everybody an opportunity to address whatever objections.

The only objection you could raise now, it seems to me, is on the basis of the sale shouldn't go through. You understand what it's going to be, or you don't know what the sale order is.

I'm going to give you a chance to see what the proposed sale order is and I'm going to get this thing over with one way or the other, and then you could take this to another court. This case is four years old. I don't want it to be any older. Your rights, I think, are preserved. You could file whatever motions you want.

As you say, you're going to take a position on this in any event. You know that someone's going to be shooting

at your client.

MR. SCARPONE: That's correct, Judge. But I do want to see the order, because we had some problems in the past --

THE COURT: You're going to see it.

MR. SCHREIBER: Your Honor, I've given them --

MR. SCARPONE: I wanted time to read it, too.

THE COURT: I'm going to give you a chance -That's a good point. Not only are you going to see it,
you're going to be able read it.

MR. SCARPONE: Well, thank you, Judge.

MR. SCHREIBER: Thank you, Judge. For the record, I have -- while Your Honor was engaged in colloquy with Mr. Scarpone, I have given each of them a copy of the order so the record is clear. They each have the order.

THE COURT: All right. Now, everybody has the order? Everybody's got it.

MR. BAINTON: Your Honor, just because -- you know, Mr. Grossman and I, while we're friends personally, we've not always been friends in this courtroom.

What these fellows are telling you is the unvarnished truth. They made an application some time ago to amend the amended sale order. And in support of that application they gave everybody on the service list a form of order.

Now, that's the form of order they're asking you to sign. Folks have had it -- the verbiage for weeks. We -- we have asked for one small change, which we've told you about.

The order literally says that the money will be paid to the debtors. For reasons which need no explanation, we don't want any cash going to Mr. Licata. We want the money to stay with the lawyers, the debtor's lawyers, so that it can be disbursed according to the plan. And trust me, under the plan of reorganization, Mr. Licata's not getting a dime.

So the only change that we're making is to make abundantly clear that the money is never going to be in any place other than Arent Fox or disbursed pursuant to an order of this court. It's not going to Mr. Licata.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. BAINTON: So this is a smoke screen.

THE COURT: I don't care -- I'm not -- don't draw me into the Licata target. I'm only dealing with what I've got now. What happens later on, I'll deal with when it happens later on.

MR. BAINTON: My point is only everybody's had this form of order for weeks.

THE COURT: All right.

Fiore Transcription Service, Inc.

MR. BAINTON: That's my only point.

THE COURT: All right. Okay. So now I have to

give you all a chance to read it without interruption. How much time do you need to need do that, having in mind that I want to be -- I've got to keep an appointment so I ought to be leaving here about 20 of. Do you want to come back here at about 2:15?

MR. BAINTON: Well, we could do this, Your Honor.

My friend, Mr. McCarthy, has a copy of the order that was

filed. Obviously, the date needs to be changed. That's the

other change. We need to change the date. But we have the

text.

If you would like to take a brief adjournment, we could avail ourselves of the photocopy machine and give to the people who have copies of this order -- it's interlineated (sic). You can't sign it. But you have the text.

We can come back in however long they need to read it, 15 minutes, and talk about its text and we'll email you the corrected copy, because you don't want to sign an order where we've changed the date. But we can email you a copy.

THE COURT: Well, it's going to an electronic order.

MR. BAINTON: Pardon me?

THE COURT: It will be an electronic order.

MR. BAINTON: Exactly. But my only point is as I stand here I can give all of these people the form of order

1 with the date changed in pen. We can talk about what it says 2 and then assuming there even might be changes, we'll file 3 whatever we agree. 4 THE COURT: All right. 5 MR. BAINTON: So we don't need to take all that 6 time. 7 THE COURT: Okay. This is going go to be --MR. BAINTON: If you want to break for 15 minutes, 8 9 we'll go to the photocopy machine and give everybody a set. 10 THE COURT: This is going to be a sale on a 363(b) 11 and (f) with certain interests held; some interest being 12 subject to and the Lionel position remains the same and I've 13 ruled on that. 14 And if you get what you want, that is those of you 15 who want it, the sale proceeds will fund a plan which is 16 going to come up quickly. 17 ALL: Yes, Your Honor. 18 THE COURT: All right. Why don't we -- if I give 19 you all say till a quarter after, does that give you enough 20 time to read it? If not, I'll give you more time. 21 MR. SCHREIBER: It does, Your Honor. 22 THE COURT: Is that enough time? Gentlemen? Those 23 who haven't seen it? 24 MR. DAUGHERTY: Thank you, Your Honor. 25 THE COURT: I don't hear anybody say it isn't.

```
1
        All right. I'll see you at quarter after.
 2
                   MR. SCHREIBER: Thank you, Your Honor.
 3
              (Recess from 12:05 p.m. until 12:21 p.m.)
 4
                   THE COURT: All right. We have everybody we need?
 5
        Mr. Grossman is not here.
 6
              (Pause.)
 7
                  MR. ROBERT GROSSMAN: Sorry, Your Honor.
                   THE COURT: All right. All right, Mr. Grossman, go
 8
 9
        ahead.
10
                  MR. BAINTON: Your Honor, we have distributed copies
11
        -- sorry. Never mind.
12
                  MR. ROBERT GROSSMAN: Your Honor, I was needing --
13
        servicing other people. I believe everybody has now read the
        order. I stand on my prior comments and we ask the Court to
14
15
        enter the order.
16
                  THE COURT: All right. Does anybody need more time
17
        to look at the order?
18
             (No audible response.)
19
                  Okay. How much more time do you need?
20
             (Pause.)
21
                  Mr. Daugherty, could you finish this?
22
             (Pause.)
23
                  All right. I want to make sure everybody knows what
24
        I am being asked to sign. I'll take a ten-minute recess --
25
        it won't make much sense take a ten-minute recess, because I
```

1 have to recess again in 20 minutes. So I might as well --2 I'll see you all a little bit after 2:00. 3 MS. NEVINS: Your Honor, if I may. I'm sorry. I am 4 required to appear in New Haven at 3:00 and I'm going to have 5 to leave here at 2:00 to be there. 6 THE COURT: Which court do you have to go to? 7 MS. NEVINS: It's Judge Weil's court, Your Honor. 8 THE COURT: I want to finish this today. If the 9 Internal Revenue Service has a position --10 MS. NEVINS: I very much want to as well. 11 THE COURT: -- I'm going to have to hold you here. 12 So I think maybe you'd better advise the parties down there 13 that there is a risk that you're going to be here, unless 14 you're going to tell me that you've seen the order, you have 15 no objection to it. If you're going to object to it, I want 16 to have your objection on the record. 17 MS. NEVINS: Your Honor, I don't intend to object

MS. NEVINS: Your Honor, I don't intend to object to the order, but I do have additional comments that I'd like to put on the record regarding the order, just so the record is very clear.

I will call Judge Weil's --

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Well, could you do that now? Put it on the record?

MS. NEVINS: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: If you could put it on the record now

and then say on the basis of what you've put on the record you consent to the entry of the order as to its form and content, then -- and then if you ask to be excused, I'll excuse you, so long as we understand that you have said everything that you have to say.

MS. NEVINS: Thank you, Your Honor.

With respect to the order that's been circulated, I have received a copy today of what is going to be ordered, or what is going to be presented to Your Honor for consideration and I have no objection to it.

I do understand there's a change with respect to a date that is going to be made and I have no objection to that change.

The comment that I wanted to place on the record is that there have been discussions among the parties about the terms of a plan of reorganization and a term sheet was circulated to Your Honor's chambers last night and to all the parties, and I've had subsequent discussions with counsel relating to the terms of that term sheet.

There have been some oral modifications to the term sheet agreed to and I am making no objection to the entry of the sale order based on those oral representations of changes and modifications to the term sheet and in particular to the treatment of the IRS and some other matters.

Your Honor, finally, with respect to some of the

other topics and some of the issues raised by Mr. Daugherty and the motion to convert, I have questions of Mr. Licata relating to certain documents that have been circulated among the parties that form some of the bases for Mr. Daugherty's motion to convert.

I would like to inquire of Mr. Licata relating to those and I would like to inquire of the court, if the court could inquire if the debtor's counsel will accept service of a subpoena under a Rule 2004 order, which I intend to apply for, Your Honor, to have Mr. Licata appear in a deposition at the U.S. Attorney's Office to answer questions about some of those documents.

THE COURT: All right. Is Mr. Licata's attorney here?

MR. ROBERT GROSSMAN: Your Honor, as the debtor's counsel, as Mr. Licata as a debtor, we certainly would.

MS. NEVINS: My understanding is he's a debtor and a debtor-in-possession.

MR. ROBERT GROSSMAN: Yes. He's a debtor and a debtor-in-possession. We would accept service of the subpoena for that purpose.

THE COURT: All right. Does that satisfy you?

MS. NEVINS: Yes. Thank you.

THE COURT: All right. Anything else you want to

add?

1 MS. NEVINS: No, Your Honor, and I thank you for 2 inquiring and allowing me to make the other court appearance. 3 THE COURT: You're quite welcome. Anything else? All right. Then why don't I see 4 you people back here around a quarter after 2:00. Court's 5 6 adjourned -- court's in recess. 7 (Recess at 12:26 p.m.) 8 (Remaining portion of proceedings transcribed under 9 separate cover.) I, CHRISTINE FIORE, court-approved transcriber, certify 10 11 that the foregoing is a correct transcript from the official 12 electronic sound recording of the proceedings in the above-13 entitled matter. 14 Christin Fiere 15 16 June 8, 2006 17 Christine Fiore 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25